



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

RECENT LITERATURE ON COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY

The fourth edition of Delbrück's *Einleitung in das Studium der indogermanischen Sprachen* (Leipzig, 1904: pp. 142) characterizes one aspect of the history of the science of comparative philology as follows: "The science of language at first undertook a lofty flight; scholars were sure of their ability to solve the riddles of morphology and word formation, they confidently constructed a primitive language, determined the home of the people who spoke it, and traced their separation and the migrations of the several nations. To-day, however, our attitude toward such glottogonic and ethnologic problems is cautious, groping, hesitating, and often disdainful". But as early as 1900 the pendulum had begun to swing in the other direction, and it has since acquired momentum. It is precisely these remoter and more fundamental problems that have been most copiously treated within the last four or five years. Consequently Delbrück's excellent little book is already out of date.

The revival of interest in the theoretical side of the science has been largely promoted by Wundt's *Völkerpsychologie, I die Sprache* (Leipzig, 1900). A second edition, which appeared in 1904, makes no material advance beyond the first.

The philosophical as distinct from the psychological point of view is illustrated in Karl Vossler's two books, *Positivismus und Idealismus in der Sprachwissenschaft* (Heidelberg, 1904), and *Sprache als Schöpfung und Entwicklung* (Heidelberg, 1905). The development of language is explained from the phenomena of style; sound-change, for example, is said to be ultimately due to the varying intonation required by differences in situation, context, etc. Both books are suggestive throughout, but the conclusions will hardly be accepted without modification.

Francis A. Wood, in an article entitled *How are Words Related?*, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 18. 1-49, shows the danger in basing etymology upon synonymy.

Important discussions of Indo-European ablaut are

F. A. Wood, Indo-European $\overset{x}{a} : \overset{x}{a} \overset{x}{i} : \overset{x}{a} \overset{x}{u}$, a study in ablaut and in word formation (*Strassburg*, 1905), and N. Van Wijk, *Zum indogermanischen Ablaut*, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 20. 332-346. The latter tries to show that some posttonic vowels were not reduced by the series of changes that produced ablaut, and that in certain cases these vowels were lengthened under a secondary accent.

A. Thumb, writing on *Psychologische Studien über die sprachlichen Analogiebildungen*, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 22. 1-55, continues the work he began several years ago in collaboration with K. Marbe, the psychologist. It is quite possible that tables showing what other word is most commonly suggested by each of a number of given words, and

the time required for the process, will one day yield tangible results for linguistic science. But that day can hardly come until we have at hand a great many records of unquestioned validity, and at present other philologists show little inclination to follow Thumb into the field of experimental psychology.

H. Oertel and E. P. Morris publish an *Examination of the Theories Regarding the Nature and Origin of Indo-European Inflection*, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 16 (1905), 68-122. They find that adaptation was the main factor, i. e. that suffixes and inflectional endings were at first meaningless, and got their force from word-meaning and context. Hence there never existed any 'fundamental' meanings of case, mood, etc. More daring and far less trustworthy is Herman Hirt's *Ueber den Ursprung der Verbalflexion im Indogermanischen*, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 17. 36-84.

Eduard Hermann's article, *Ueber das Rekonstruieren*, *Kuhn's Zeitschrift* 41. 1-64, is characterized by extreme caution. The author prefers to work backwards from the several historical languages as far as possible before resorting to comparison.

The theory that Indo-European and Semitic sprang from a common origin has often been suggested and rejected. The first scholar equipped with exact knowledge of both fields to undertake its defence is H. Möller in his book *Semitisch und Indogermanisch, I Konsonanten* (Kopenhagen and Leipzig, 1906). His argument rests necessarily upon a series of phonetic laws which describe the variations of the two main branches from the assumed parent language. On the Indo-European side Möller starts with the hypothetical forms that all Indo-European scholars use (though with varying views as to their value). For the other term of the comparison, however, he has to construct for himself a prehistoric Semitic. Some reviewers see in this preliminary task the chief value of the book. The main thesis has been accepted by two or three scholars, notably by Holgar Pedersen, of the University of Copenhagen, who, in fact, was already of the same opinion. Möller's book has led him to discuss *Die indogermanisch-semitische Hypothese und die indogermanische Lautlehre*, *IF.* 22. 341-365.

Prehistoric Indo-European antiquities and history have been treated by several writers. J. Hoops, *Waldbäume und Kulturpflanzen im germanischen Altertum* (Strassburg, 1905), brings arguments for placing the original home of the Indo-Europeans in North Germany. Louis Erhardt, however, in an article on *Die Einwanderung der Germanen in Deutschland und die Ursitz der Indogermanen*, *Historische Vierteljahrschrift* 8 (1905), 473-508, thinks that historic data (in Tacitus and elsewhere) make it impossible to suppose that the Germans were autochthonous.

Of the utmost importance is H. Hirt's *Die Indo-*

germanen, ihre Verbreitung, ihre Urheimat, und ihre Kultur (Strassburg, 1905-1907). Like other books from the same pen, it is distinguished by exhaustive learning and brilliant originality, but marred by overconfidence. The boundaries of the original territory, which the author places in North Germany, are stated more definitely and the several migrations described in greater detail than was usual even in the early days of the science. It must be granted that Hirt starts with more numerous and more certainly proven facts than his predecessors, but he has their disconcerting habit of drawing a "probable" conclusion and then building a lofty structure upon it. Many of Hirt's theories are discussed by A. Fick, *Die Indogermanen*, KZ. 41. 336 ff. He shows, for example, that some of Hirt's arguments against South Russia as the primitive home are unsound.

Otto Schrader's *Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte* has appeared in a third, thoroughly revised edition (Jena, 1906-1907). This and the same author's *Reallexicon* are still the standard works, although in some respects inferior to Hirt's book.

The Macedonian question has been treated with great thoroughness by Otto Hoffmann, *Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum* (Göttingen, 1906). Macedonian is shown to be a Greek dialect, most nearly related to Thessalian. There are important reviews by Solmsen, *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 27 (1907), 270 ff., and by Buck, *Class. Phil.* 3 (1908), 102 f. The former argues that the use of the mediae for the Greek aspirates, as well as other peculiarities, was borrowed from a non-Hellenic source. The latter points out that the language very likely could not be recognized as Greek by the Greeks themselves.

P. Kretschmer, in an article on *Ionier und Achäer*, *Glotta* 1. 1, suggests that the Ionians were the first Hellenes to settle in Greece. After they had spread over the islands of the Aegean, the Achaeans invaded the land, much as the Dorians did at a later day.

An article by C. D. Buck, on *The Interrelations of the Greek Dialects*, *Class. Phil.* 2 (1907), 241-276, gives a chart of the dialectic variations which bear upon the subject.

The most important volume of recent years on Indo-European Comparative Philology is Brugmann's *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, II *Lehre von den Wortformen und ihrem Gebrauch*, 1 *Allgemeines, Zusammensetzung, Nominalstämme*, Zweite Bearbeitung (Strassburg, 1906). It is misleading to call this the second edition of the volume that appeared in 1889. It is really a new book: the increase in the number of pages—from 462 to 688—does not fully represent the increase in the subject matter, for the treatment is now more compact. As indicated in the title, usage is now treated side by side with form, an ar-

rangement already adopted in the author's *Kurze vergleichende Grammatik*.

The second edition of Meillet's *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes* (Paris, 1908) is a thorough revision of an excellent work published in 1903. Some parts of the book, notably the treatment of morphology, have been considerably enlarged.

The sixth edition of Henry's *Précis de grammaire comparée du Grec et du Latin* (Paris, 1908) does not show the changes that might have been expected if the author had lived to make the revision himself.

J. M. Redmond's *Introduction to Comparative Philology for Classical Students* (Cambridge, 1906) has been "damned with faint praise" by Prellwitz in the current volume of *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift*, 1027. The writer has not seen it.

A. Meillet, *Les dialectes indo-européennes* (Paris, 1908) discusses the progressive development or evolution of the Indo-European languages, laying particular emphasis upon the fact that they all develop in the same direction—toward simplicity and regularity in morphology and syntax. There is a brief summary of the subject in the ninth chapter of the above-mentioned edition of the same author's *Introduction*.

Coincident with the revival of interest in the remoter problems of the science, more and more attention is being paid to details in the history of the several languages: one sees nowadays more discussion of etymologies and less of phonetic laws; there are more articles on the Greek or the Latin perfect than on the Indo-European perfect. It will be impossible to mention here even the most important of these papers, but the tendency will be evident from the grammars and etymological dictionaries mentioned below.

Jacob Wackernagel's *Altindische Grammatik*, II. 1 *Einleitung zur Wortlehre und Nominalkomposition* (Göttingen, 1905) is a continuation of the invaluable *Lautlehre* published in 1896.

Thumb's *Handbuch des Sanskrit mit Texten und Glossar, eine Einführung in das Sprachwissenschaftliche Studium des Altindischen* (Heidelberg, 1905), like the first grammar in its series, Sommer's *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* (1902), is an excellent school book, but not merely a school book. The appended reader, however, is full of misprints, and much too difficult for beginners.

Chr. Bartholomae's *Altiranisches Wörterbuch* (pp. XXXII + columns 2000: Strassburg, 1904) is of the utmost importance for comparative purposes, as may be inferred from the fact that it has enabled Brugmann to treat Iranian with something like the same fullness as Indic in the new edition of the second volume of the *Grundriss*. Important additions are to be found in the same author's *Zum altiranischen Wörterbuch*, Beiheft zum 19. Band der IF. (1906: pp. 287).

The most important recent contributions to Greek grammar are Edwin Mayer, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit, Laut- und Wortlehre* (Leipzig, 1906), and R. Helbing, *Grammatik der Septuaginta, Laut- und Wortlehre* (Göttingen, 1907). Both books are thoroughly reliable helps in the study of the Greek *κοινή* although Helbing seems unfamiliar with modern linguistic theory.

Paula Wahrmann's *Prolegomena zu einer Geschichte der griechischen Dialekte im Zeitalter des Hellenismus* (1907: pp. 23) contains a useful discussion of the sources of our knowledge of the dialects, with especial reference to the date of their extinction.

Stürmer's *Griechische Lautlehre auf etymologischer Grundlage* (Halle, 1907) is a supplement to the school grammars and is intended to be placed in the hands of young students.

Walther Prellwitz's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der griechischen Sprache, zweite verbesserte Auflage* (Göttingen, 1905) differs from the first edition chiefly in the introduction of some citations of literature. It must still be used with caution.

There is every reason to hope, however, that we shall soon have a satisfactory work on Greek etymology in Émile Boisacq's *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Heidelberg and Paris, part 1, 1907, part 2, 1908). The treatment is fuller than that of Prellwitz: the first three letters of the alphabet, which are already at hand, cover 160 pages as against 102 in the earlier book. Citations of literature are very full, and pains are taken to separate the doubtful from the certain.

Max Niedermann, *Précis de phonétique historique du Latin* (Paris, 1906; cf. Id., *Historische Lautlehre des Lateinischen, deutsche Bearbeitung* von Ed. Hermann, Heidelberg, 1907), is the best introduction to Latin phonology for young students; it is accurate and systematic, but still easily understood.

C. E. Bennett, *The Latin Language, a historical outline of its sounds, inflections, and syntax*, (Boston, 1907), a new edition of the same author's Appendix, is, in spite of many inaccuracies, the best book of the sort in English.

C. F. Grandgent, professor of Romance Languages at Harvard, has published *An Introduction to Vulgar Latin* (Boston, 1907), which contains a large amount of conveniently classified material. The frequent statements about the Italic dialects and the prehistoric period of Latin require to be constantly checked by reference to such grammars as those by Sommer and Buck, which we mention elsewhere. The usefulness of the book would have been increased if the author had omitted some unimportant and doubtful details, and given a fuller explanation of some others that are of prime importance.

A. Walde, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (pp. XLVIII + 807: Heidelberg, 1906), is a

book of the first rank. Each article gives exhaustive references to recent literature, but this causes no confusion, since the theory which the author believes to be correct is duly emphasized. The book is fully abreast of the times, and contains noteworthy contributions by the author.

Gustav Körting, *Lateinisch-Romanisches Wörterbuch, dritte Ausgabe* (Paderborn, 1907), is, like the earlier editions, extremely important for students of colloquial Latin as well as for Romance scholars. It must, however, be used with caution.

P. Regnaud's *Dictionnaire étymologique du Latin et du Grec dans ses rapports avec le Latin* (Lyons and Paris, 1908) is unsound in method and displays ignorance of all recent work in Latin etymology.

C. D. Buck, *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian* (Boston, 1904), is an excellent manual for the study of these long-neglected Italic dialects, and at the same time a convenient and reliable reference book for scholars in related fields.

Wenzel Vondrák, *Vergleichende slavische Grammatik, I Lautlehre und Stammbildungslehre* (Göttingen, 1906), will be of service; but W. Porzezinski, *Archiv für slavische Philologie* 29. 411-428, points out several fundamental errors in method.

Two important changes in the journals devoted to the science deserve notice. Beginning with 1907, Bezenberger's *Beiträge zur Kunde der indogermanischen Sprachen* was merged in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, under the latter title. The new series begins with Volume 41. The editors are A. Bezenberger, E. Kuhn, and W. Schulze. The combined journal is to issue more frequently than either of its predecessors. The same year saw the beginning of a new linguistic periodical, *Glotta, Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache*, herausgegeben von Paul Kretschmer und Franz Skutsch (Göttingen).

BARNARD COLLEGE

E. H. STURTEVANT.

REVIEWS

Primitive Athens as Described by Thucydides. By Jane Ellen Harrison. Cambridge, England, at the University Press (1906). Pp. xii + 168. 6s net.

Πηγήν μὲν πολὺκρουνον Ἀθηναίης ἀνέφηνας,
Πηγή δ' αὐτὸς ἔφυσ καλλιῤῥου σοφίης.

With this graceful tribute Miss Harrison dedicates to Wilhelm Dörpfeld her second work on the topography of ancient Athens. Her frankly avowed purpose is to set forth clearly and connectedly the views of Professor Dörpfeld on the topography of primitive Athens and thereby to give to the reader as clear a picture as possible of the city in the days of its comparative obscurity. In successfully accomplishing this purpose, she has rendered a most important service to all students of the Classics, to those